

A SECOND
EDITION
OF THE
DEBATE
IN THE
SHOP
ABOUT
IMPARITY
AMONG
PASTORS.

Wherein the first Edition by an *Episcopal-Divine* is Corrected and Amended.

And his Arguments are clearly Exposed and Answered.

By the *Presbyterian* concerned therein.

Prov. 14. 16. *The Fool rages and is confident.*

Jude verse 9. *Yet Michael the Arch-Angel when contending with the Devil, he disputed about the Body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing Accusation, but said, the LORD rebuke thee.*

A SECOND
 EDITION
 OF THE
 DEBATE
 IN THE
 SHOP. &c.

THough I be very unwilling to trouble either the Press or the World with any thing of this Nature ; yet being most injuriously treated and that in a matter of Publick concern by one who calls himself an Episcopal Divine in his printed Pamphlet, entitled, *Imparity among Pastors* &c. I reckon my self obliged to give a true Representation of that whole Debate wherein I was by an utter Surprize engaged, that so the Judicious and Impartial may judge both of him and me.

In *Jun* last I went into a Stationers Shop to enquire for a Book that I designed to buy, beside those concerned in the Shop, there were two Men sitting cloathed in Black and Bands about their Necks, neither of whom I knew, I asked the Youth that kept the Shop, if such a Book was there ? he told me it was not, but he offered to sell me a Pamphlet, called, the *Case of the Episcopal Clergie* &c. and asked if I would take one of them ? I answered, I had got one of them already, and that I supposed by that time there was an Answer to it in Print, Whereupon one of the foresaid Strangers

ers spake some words; and I liking to be Civil to all Men, did Reply to him again, and some few Sentences past to and again in a way of Civil discourse. I do remember that then I said, *I suppose Gentlemen you may be Episcopal Ministers, (your Habit makes me to think so) there seems to be no need of making so much ado for a Toleration, seeing any of you that are deserving may be received into Communion with Presbyterians upon easie Terms, and there is nothing that is sinfull required of any of you in order to Church-Communion.* One of them Replyed, *We cannot comply with their Terms, for they require us to confess a Fault, and to profess our Repentance for Officiating under Episcopacy, else they will not receive us; and that we cannot do.* (He that spake those Words, was the Man that made the following Debate, the other that seemed to be the discreetest, held his Peace, and a little after, went away.) I said to him, there is no such thing required by the Assembly in the formula they have condescended upon (*viz.* the Assembly 1694.) he said, he knew it was required, and I told him, I knew no such thing.

Then instantly he said, *We cannot comply with the Terms offered, because we hold Episcopal Government in the Church to be of Divine Institution, and that he was ready to prove it to be so; adding, that it is evident from Timothy and Titus their Superiority over those who were ordained by them, that there is and ought to be an Imparity among Pastors.* Notwithstanding these his words, I did not then think the man deligned to debate such a point in such a place, but only in a way of civil conference to discourse a little, and so I replyed to him, that I believed, *Timothy and Titus* were extraordinary Pastors, being Evangelists, and from an Imparity between them, and these ordained by them (who were but ordinary Pastors) It could not be inferred that there ought to be a standing Imparity, among Ordinary Pastors, for the one office in the Church be Superior to another, yet these of the same office are equal in respect of power; one Apostle was not above another, nor one Evangelist above another, and the same is to be said of ordinary Pastors, all of them being of the same office, or Church officers of the same kind, none of them is superior in power unto another; He said he would not debate now, for one Apostle's being above another, &c. Nor against that, that ordinary Pastors are of the same office in the Church, but still he did hold that *Timothy and Titus* were not extraordinary but ordinary pastors, and yet were Bishops above the presbyters in *Ephesus* and *Crete*. I told him that the presbyters in *Ephesus* and *Crete* were Bishops according to these scriptures, *Acts* 10. 17. with 18 and *Tit.* 1. 5. 6. And that I saw no ground to think there were any other kind of Bishops above them.

Then he spake more crabbed like, whether he hath faithfully reported

his then words in *page 23*. of his Pamphlet, I shall neither affirm nor deny, some of it, I do not remember that I heard; but this I do mind, that he said, *Timothy was not an Evangelist*; And I Replied, he was enjoined to do the Work of an Evangelist, and that seemed to imply he was an Evangelist; I did not then quote the place, but it is *2 Tim. 4. 5*. I cannot now call to mind what he said in Answer thereunto; but something he did say, and that, as it were, in Passion, take the Words as he Reports them himself, in the last Paragraph of *Page 23*. he says, *that Timothy was not called an Evangelist*, and what then? *Stephen* was not called a Deacon in exprels Terms yet he was a Deacon; So because *Timothy* is not expressly called an Evangelist, it cannot be inferred that he was no Evangelist; he says, *Timothy though Bishop of Ephesus, might have done the Work of an Evangelist &c.* that he was Bishop of *Ephesus*, cannot be made out, but it is clear from the Text he was called unto the Work of an Evangelist, and obliged to do it without any such Distinction of Places, and Seasons as this Man insinuates; and hence there is more ground to think that the Work of an Evangelist was the Work of *Timothy's* Calling and Function, than to think it was but a By-work, which now and then, and in some places he might try his hand upon.

In the same place of this Pamphlet I perceive he limits the Evangelists Work, meerly unto *Preaching and Baptizing*; and if there was no more of it but that, than the Work of the meanest Pastor doth go beyond it; for he hath Power not only to Preach and Baptize, but according to the Scripture, to Dispense the LORDS Supper, &c. Now it seems to be absurd to say that a Parish Pastor's Work is greater than an Evangelists was; what if it should be said, that the Evangelists Work is comprehensive of all those Ministerial performances required, and recommended unto *Timothy* and *Titus* in these Epistles directed unto them, I doubt if my Adversary can disprove it.

I remember he went on, and spake to this Purpose, that the *Quakers* had as good Ground for what they said against a Standing Ministry by *Parity*, calling it Temporary, as *Presbyterians* had to say, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were extraordinary Officers; And he asked me a Reason, why the one might not hold as well as the other? I told him, the *Quakers* were against a Standing Ministry without regard either to *Parity* or *Imparity*, and we have sufficient Ground from that Scripture, *Matth. 28. 19, 20* to maintain against them, that there is, and will be a Standing Ministry to the Worlds end; for an *Imparity* among ordinary Pastors, it did not yet appear from the Scripture.

Then he seemed to be very passionat, I desired him to restrain his Passion, and to speak Soberly to me, as I did to him. He said to this purpose, it was his manner, and he could not help it; But he would prove an *Imparity* among

mong Ordinary Pastors by an impregnable Argument; I told him, it was not time and place convenient, being in a Publick Shop; but if he had any thing to say to me, I might be found at my Chamber. He asked my Name? which I told him, as also the Place I Lodged at. So I thought I had done with him for that time, and was about to come away.

But ere ever I turned about, he brake out again, saying, he would write his Argument presently, and see what I could say unto it; I desired to waive it for the forelaid Reason, but he urged me with such vehemency, that at length I gave way unto him. Before he began to write, he asked me, if I would not give him a written Answer? I said, if he wrote an Argument in Form to prove an *Imparity* among Ordinary Pastors, I would not refuse to Answer it, and he seemed to me to promise he would do so. Forthwith he he got a piece Paper, and fell a writing; The Words, he says, he wrote to me, are as follows, *When Episcopal Divines argue from the known Texts in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus for Imparity among Pastors of the Church, the Presbyterians Answer Timothy and Titus were extraordinary and temporary Officers in the Church, whereby they acknowledge the Gospel Ministry, Imparity, but say that it was temporary, when the Presbyterians argue from the same known Texts for a Standing Ministry in Parity by laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery. The Quakers and other Sectaries Answer, that that Ministry by Parity & laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, was extraordinary, temporary, adapted to the Infancy of the Church, and not to be continued for after Ages; now I desire to know a Reason, why on and the same Reason given by the Sectarians should not be relevant against Presbyterians arguing for a Standing Ministry by Parity, &c. as well as they repute their Answer relevant against Episcopal Divines arguing as said is. And I desire to know how these Presbyterians can prove a Standing Ministry by Parity from these Texts, when the Imparity is as clear as the Ministry and its perpetual Duration.* And when he had done, he gave me the Paper, desiring me to subjoin my Answer. I took it from him, and read it (I cannot now after ten Weeks time remember if his printed Words be the same that he then wrote) after reading I told him, he had not formed any such Argument as he promised, and I could not Answer that which was not.

At this he was enraged, and cryed out, *will you not Answer me as ye promised, will you break your Promise?* He was so loud, that some gathered into the Shop, and about the Door. I told him again and again, he had not offered me a formal Argument to give an Answer unto, as he had undertaken; Nevertheless he made such a Noise, and prest me so hard to write something, that at last, I took the Pen, telling him, I could not write an Answer to an Argument, when there was none; but I would write somewhat which he might

might Impugn if he pleased ; Then I wrote some few Lines, not as an Answer to his, though he calls it so in his Pamphlet, but as a *Memorandum* unto him of what was under Debate, and what he had to Impugn, if he inclined unto it ; and this he might have understood from what I wrote, though I had not told him. I do not now exactly remember what was written, and therefore must take it upon trust from his report in *pag. 25.* of his said Pamphlet.

After he read the words, he said, this is no Answer to my Argument. I told him, I had no Argument before me to Answer. What, said he, is there no Argument ? you the Principal of a Colledge, and does not understand an Argument, you are indeed a brave Principal. At which, I smiling, said, he was mistaken ; and this was as Oyl to the Fire of his Passion, which further broke out, in a number of bitter Words, which I did not retain ; and at last, with a Bravade, he put up the Paper, (wherein both he and I had written) into his Pocket. If this was discreetly done, I leave to others to judge.

However, in my written Words, as he reports them. First, The Case under Consideration is briefly Stated, *that which is under Consideration, is, Whether there be an Imparity among those of the same Office in the Church.* This, he says, is a down right Falshood. But let him remember, that I had affirmed unto him, that Ordinary Pastors are all of the same Office and Kind, and he had said he would not contravert it, and nevertheless held that there was an *Imparity* among them, which I denyed, and he undertook to prove, though in his Pamphlet, he makes all to run in his own Channel, yet something of this may be gleaned even from his own Words at the end of *Page 22.* and in *Page 23.* of his Pamphlet. Now when I saw he had written no Argument to prove his Point, as was undertaken ; but that he had manifestly strayed from the thing in Hand, and run out in his needless Queries, asking Reasons of this and that, and seeing he had prest me to write, I thought it best to reduce him again, if possible, to the Point under Consideration ; which was as I wrote, *viz Whether there be an Imparity among those of the same Office in the Church, as ordinary Pastors are ?* and he may as well say that Truth is a Falshood, as to say, that this was a Falshood. The thing it self, as truly represented, declares the contrary of what he avers ; And does he think the Witnesses so silly, as to Attest a Truth to be a Falshood.

After this first Sentence of my written Words, there are next two things therein that I say are asserted by *Presbyterians.* 1. *That there is no Imparity among those of the same Office, as all ordinary Pastors are.* This was the very thing he undertook to Refute, but has not yet done it. 2. *That Diocesan Pastors have no warrant from Divine Institution, to be Office Bearers in the Church.* These are the Assertions that I said are largely written upon, and offered

offered to be maintained against any Opponent. He says, I wrote, By any Opponents. Is it was so, it was *error Manus*, not *Mentis*; and if it was otherwise, he is either mistaken, or has misrepresented it.

The Second of the foresaid Assertions, *that Diocesan Prelats have no warrant from Divine Institution.* This, he says is but *meer cant and sham*; and if this be his way to Refute it, it is easie for him to Refute any thing; but he adds somewhat in the close of page 25. viz. *That there were no Parochial Presbyters, more than Diocesan Prelats; because there were no Dioceses divided into Parishes, &c.* He tells us not when it was so, but I guess he means the first primitive Times; and what doth all that make for him, he will grant that since the primitive Times, there have been *Diocesan Prelats*; and what doth he say for the Divine Institution of their Office in opposition to the former *Thesis*? just nothing to the purpose.

There was a Clause insert in the words I wrote, as reported by him, viz. *If any who appears for that Interest Symbolize with Quakers it cannot be helped.* That which gave occasion for it, as I remember, was this, he seemed to me to speak something more favourably of *Quakers* than of *Presbyterians*, and to justify the one more than the other; he had said before this, *he will never be Presbyterian, and he will never join with Presbyterians, he had rather join with* ~~ssssssss~~ And because of this, it was, that something to this purpose was written. But what needed the Man turn then so furious, and what moves him yet in page 26. of his Pamphlet, to vent such foolish Invectives, he calls himself a Divine, but an ordinary Christian may see that his words favour neither of Divinity nor Humanity.

When I saw his Passions rise to so great a height, I do profess I was troubled in my self for being so long in such a Man's Company; and I would gladly have been gone, not from any fear of his reason, but from dislike and weariness of his Passion; yet I was unwilling to go away abruptly, but resolved to Answer no more to his vain Janglings; yet he continued pressing me with such shameless importunity, that in a manner he extorted Words from me; when he made a deal of Clamour for an Answer to his Argument, which he said he had written to me; and insulted as if I had nothing to say; I told him, as before, he *had given me no Argument to Answer*; then, said he, *I will form you an Argument, and put it in a Syllogism*; and accordingly he did attempt it: When I heard it, I told him, it was a bad Syllogism: then he couped it over again, I told him, it did not directly prove that which he undertook to prove, viz. *Imparity among ordinary Pastors*, which I had denied, and yet I say the same; for if he had argued according to Rule, then his conclusion should have directly affirmed what I had denied; and

Logicians

Logicians make this kind of Argument, that he uses, in such a Case, to be a kind of Sophism. And now after all his dressing the said Argument and publishing it in print, it labours still of the same Infirmity; But least either himself, or any other, should think, or say, that I make but this a shift to evade the dint of this mighty Argument, as unable to yoke with it, I shall make some attempt upon it, and I hope, the LORD assisting me, I shall evidently discover, at least to all the Judicious, that it is nothing but Wind and Vapour, And here is his Argument as framed by himself page 26.

If the Presbyterians Answer, calling a Standing Ministry by Imparitie: extra ordinary and temporary, be good and relevant against Episcopal Divines arguing from the known Texts in those Epistles for the apostles Ministry; then the same Answer given by the Quakers &c. to the Presbyterians arguing for a Standing Ministry by Parity, and laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, is good and relevant against the Presbyterians.

But you (Presbyterians) will not grant this, viz. that the Quakers Answer is good and relevant against you.

Therefore you must not plead that, viz. that your Answer is good and relevant against the Episcopalians,

Thus we have it set before us, and though I can Answer it in a few words; yet for making things appear in their own colour, and that the Strength, or rather the Weakness of it, may be the more evident I shall offer a Parallel unto it; The Jews hold that Moses way of Worship is the only true & standing way, and for this they argue from Scripture; Again, the Christians hold, that Moses Way is done away, and they argue that Christs way is the only standing way of Worship; And lastly, the Turks they affirm that both of these are done away, and Mahomets way is to be observed. Suppose then a Jew should attack my Adversary being a Christian with this Argument.

If the Christians Answer, saying, that Moses Standing way of Worship is done away, be good and relevant against the Jews arguing from Scripture for the said Way, then the same Answer given by the Turk to the Christian arguing for the Standing way of Christ, is good and relevant against the Christian.

But the Christian will not grant this, therefore he must not plead that.

Now, what can my Adversary Answer to this? If his own Argument be Unanswerable, as he says it is, then sure this is Unanswerable too; for it is exactly paralleled to it in Form, and the Strength of it is as great; might not then a Jew so arguing even confound him. But further, I shall make a few Observes upon his Argument, before I give a direct Answer. 1. He does not State a Question, nor shew what Thesis he Impugns, or Propugns (neither was it ever done by him in his Discourse with me more than what I have already

already said) he strikes, and does not tell against what, that is no fair dealing; It seems he leaves us to gather it from the Conclusion of his Argument, that he proves *Presbyterians* should not plead that their Answer to *Episcopalians* is good and relevant, calling a Standing Ministry by *Imparity* extraordinary and temporary; either it must be this, or nothing; And if the *Presbyterians* give no such Answer as his Words bear, where is he then?

2. He says that *Presbyterians* give this Answer to *Episcopal Divines* arguing from known Texts, &c. It had been fit he had told particularly what these Texts are, lest he be mistaken about the *Presbyterians* Answer unto their arguings from some of these Texts. And,

3. He makes the *Quakers* to Reply against a Ministry by *Parity*; whereas, they are against all Standing Ministry, whether by *Parity* or *Imparity*, as was said before; Wherefore, it seems to concern him and his Party, as well as *Presbyterians*, if the Consequent of his Major be framed suitably to the *Quakers* Answer, it should run thus, *then the same Answer given by the Quakers to the Presbyterians and Episcopalians arguing for a Standing Ministry is good and relevant against them both*; and if he had not wilfully Concealed some part of the Truth in that Affair, he had surely made it run so, and then what an Argument had it been.

These Things being premised, I Answer his Argument thus; That it concludes nothing against the *Presbyterians* at all; for they plead no such thing as he insinuates in his Conclusion, and give no such Answer, as he deceitfully Frames in his Major. It is a most unjust Charge for him to say that they call a Standing Ministry by *Imparity* extraordinary and temporary; I think he will not affirm that any *Presbyterian* doth say a Standing Ministry is temporary, that is, a Standing Ministry is no Standing Ministry; He will be ashamed to impute such Nonsense and Contradiction unto them. But I know he means a Standing Ministry in the *Episcopal*-sense, which he says *Presbyterians* call extraordinary and temporary. Now, what Ministry is this? It is a Ministry by *Prelate* Bishops having the Sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction above *Presbyters*; this must be his Standing Ministry, else he is not conformant to himself. Now, to say that *Presbyterians* call this Ministry extraordinary and temporary, is most False; For they Maintain there never was such a Ministry Instituted by CHRIST, or the Apostles in His Name, and that it ought not to be in the Church of CHRIST. Seeing then they neither answer nor plead any such thing as he says, his argument concludes nothing against them; this is so clear and plain, that it may be easily seen, that instead of an argument, which he boasts of, as *Solid, and Unanswerable*, he hath given us but a pitifull Sophism.

Before it be a True and Regular Syllogism, he must Reform it, and Frame it according to the Answer that is Truly given by the *Presbyterians* to the *Episcopalians* arguing for a Standing *Prelacy*; Thus they argue, *the Apostles and Timothy and Titus had the sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, and were above all other Pastors.* Therefore there should be still *Prelats* in the Church.

Presbyterians deny the Consequence, and give this as the Reason, the *Apostles* and *Evangelists*, *Timothy* and *Titus*, &c. were extraordinary Officers, and their Office was but for a time, not perpetual; Now if he Frame his Argument according to this Answer, it will be a little more Honestlike, and thus it will run.

If the *Presbyterians* Answer, calling the *Apostles* and *Evangelists* extraordinary, and their Office temporary, be good and relevant against *Episcopal Divines*, arguing for Standing *Prelacy*; then the *Quakers* Reply to *Presbyterians* arguing for a Standing *Gospel Ministry*, calling it extraordinary and temporary, is good and relevant against *Presbyterians*.

But *Presbyterians* will not grant this, therefore they must not plead that.

Yet this Argument is easily Answered by denying the Major; because it is evidently False and so the Strength of it is broken.

Now, I proceed in the *Shop Debate*. When my Adversary insisted, talking of the *Quakers* their Answer to the *Presbyterians*, I did say, that what the *Quakers* said on that Head, did militate as much against *Episcopalians*, as *Presbyterians*; for they speak against a Standing Ministry, and consequently against the one as well as the other: To this he Replied, as in page 27. *contra argumentare non est respondere.* I said it was *aliquando*. He said *nunquam*. He was then in Passion; But now when he is, I hope, come to himself, will he say that in no case what is alleaded by an Adversary, may be retorted upon himself; and that *contra argumentare* is never *respondere*, I think he will take his Word again; else he may be found to strike against the most infallible Scripture Examples.

He adds in the same page, that he told me it was down-right Non-sense to say that the *Quakers* Argument (which he formerly called Answer) did militate against *Episcopalians*; and how proves he that? For, said he, *Episcopal Divines* have no more to do, but to tell *Quakers* as well as *Presbyterians*, that they both speak an untruth, when they call them extraordinary, &c. If this be a good proof of his assertion, let any Man of Sense judge; this is a little odd that is said by him, that *Episcopal Divines* have no more to do, but to tell *Quakers* as well as *Presbyterians*, that they both speak an untruth, in calling *Timothy*

mothy and Titus extraordinary; he may try the Quakers, and see if that will satisfy them; but for the Presbyterians, he may know there is much more to do, than to tell them that *they speak an Untruth*; he and his Party must also Convince them from Scripture, which they have never yet done.

He says there, that I denied *I had said the Quakers Answer did militate as much against them, as us*: I do remember, that once I said, *that the Quakers Answer, as he Worded it, did not militate against the Episcopalians but the Presbyterians*; (for his Words are the Answer given by the Quakers to Presbyterians arguing for a Standing Ministry by Parity, and laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery) but I said, *the Quakers Errors were as much against them as the other*; and it is one of their Errors to deny a Standing Ministry; Whereupon he cryed out, and appealed to Witnesses, that *I had denied what I had said formerly*; but the contrary is evident to any that will consider the Words that I spoke. I said formerly, *that the Quakers Answer doth militate both against Presbyterians and Episcopalians, because they deny a Standing Ministry; and afterward I told him, the Quakers Answer, according to his report, did not militate against the Episcopalians, &c.* And both of these are true; and the one is not a denial of the other; But the truth is, though this Divine be a long man, yet he is sometimes so short, that he speaks without considering what he speaks; yea sometimes he speaks amiss, as when he says that *I restracted with the same breath what I had said about the Quakers Errors*; which I never did.

That which is subjoined in the 27 page, brings to my Mind that he fell a Commending himself at an high Rate, as one that had great Learning, Understanding, and skill to Foil his Adversaries, that *the Strength of his Argument for an Imparity among ordinary Pastors, was such, as none were able to stand before it*; for me and others of my kind, *he undervalued us*; for he knew more than we all, &c. when he had thus, for a while abounded in his Vain-gloriation; I said, the Scripture speaks of *a man Wise in his own Conceit* (I did not then quote the place, but it is in Prov. 26. 12) this I saw inflamed him yet more; wherefore without gainsaying, I let him bluster it out, that he was not the man.

He tells of a Laick present, who said *he was not Learned, and yet understood what was said &c.* I do indeed remember there was a Gentleman in the Shop (he was not present at the beginning, but came in afterward) and he spake some words seemingly in Favours of my Adversary; but I being uncertain whether he spake in Jest or Earnest, I did not meddle with him. The very Words he spake I have forgotten; but I think my Adversary in his

report of them, wrongs the Gentleman in two Things. 1. In giving it out, that the Gentleman cleared him of being wise in his own conceit, which all the World cannot clear him of; for out of the abundance of the Heart the Mouth speaketh; And by his printed Pamphlet, he makes a further Discovery of himself. 2. In making the Gentleman to have affirmed that as Truth, which at least was Uncertain, if not False, viz. *That he is wise in the eyes and opinion of all us that hear him*; This I say was Uncertain, if not False; for there were some at the Door, that heard as well as the Gentleman; and he had then no access to know their Sentiments, for I was between him and them, and they gave him no Signification of any such thing. Now I cannot think the Gentleman was so rash and inconsiderate; wherefore I apprehend my Adversary has wronged him.

After some little Pause, he said he could easily prove, *that even the Apostles were not extraordinary Officers in the Church; that he had seen a Book of one Mr. Vetch (in page 20. of his Pamphlet, he Names Mr. William Vetch Minister at Dumfries, but he is mistaken.) wherein, said he, it is proven by unsweasable Arguments, that the Apostles Office did not consist in their extraordinary Qualifications; but that he did not agree with the Author in placing the nature of the Apostles Office in their Power of Building the Church of CHRIST, or bringing it ex statu possibilitatis in statum existentiae, because he found a Church existent in the first Chapter of the Acts.*

This I took at spoken in a way of cursory Discourse, and said, I had not seen that Book of Mr. Vetch's; whereupon he left off to speak more of it.

But in the 28 page of his Pamphlet, he tells that he *proposed an Argument, to me, to which I Replyed not one Syllable.* This I knew not before, but now when he has been at pains to Frame it as well as he can, and to send it abroad to the World, it were pity to let it go without some notice; and he sets it down as follows,

If the Apostles, and Timothy and Titus, were extraordinary Officers of the Church; then it is either because their Office did consist in their extraordinary qualifications and gifts, immediat mission, &c. Or, because it consisted in the Architectonical power of building the Church; that is, as he explains it, their educing the Church ex statu possibilitatis in statum existentiae.

But not in the first, because of Mr. Vetch's Reasons &c. Nor yet in the last, because he sees there was a Church in Acts 1. Therefore, they were, not extraordinary Officers.

— Unto this Argument I Answer, by denying the major simpliciter; for the Apostles were extraordinary, but not upon any of these accounts that he mentions

tions; Not the first, because Qualifications for a Sacred Office, and a Call to it do not constitute the Office itself, either in whole, or in part. Not upon the account of the second, as he explains it, viz. *their educating of the Church ex statu possibilitatis, &c.* for if the Church be considered simply in itself the Apostles brought it not unto its first existence; there having been a Church existent long before the Apostles, as well as in *Act. 1.* wherefore there is just cause to deny the Major. And this Proposition being casten, the whole Superstructure of his Argument is overturned. It may be asked, upon what account the apostles were extraordinary? I answer upon the account of these things complexly taken, viz. *Their extraordinary Qualifications and Gifts, their extraordinary Mission, or Call; and their extraordinary Office, and Work.* The first two, viz. their Qualification and Mission, though these do not constitute any part of their Office as in his Major; yet they contribute unto the Specification both of the Office, and Office Bearers. For the third, viz. *Their extraordinary Office, and the Work thereof; It consisted in their Archibishoprick power of building the Church of CHRIST, to wit, their educating the Christian Church consisting of Jews and Gentiles after CHRIST's ascension ex statu possibilitatis in statum existentiae; their Instituting (by power from CHRIST, and in His Name) New Offices in the Church, and appointing New Office-bearers, their setting up and establishing the Order and Oeconomy of the Church of the New Testament, their prescribing unalterable Rules for Governing all the Churches of CHRIST to the Worlds end; In their Preaching infallible Doctrine, and confirming it by Miracles; and in their Teaching, Baptizing, Ordaining of Church officers, and their Supreme Spiritual Jurisdiction in all places wherover they could go without being fixed to any City, Province, Countrey, Kingdom, or Quarter of the Earth.* Now, in respect of these put together, the Apostles were extraordinary Office-bearers in the Church, and therein they had no Successors.

As for Timothy and Titus, whom my Adversary draws in by consequence into his Argument; they also (though not altogether upon the same score with the Apostles) were extraordinary Office-bearers in the primitive Church; and his Argument is nothing to the purpose as to them; wherefore I shall leave it, and return to the *Shop-business*.

When I had told this Divine, that I had not seen Mr. Fitch's Book, as I hinted before, he insisted no further upon that Head, but drew breath a little; whereupon I turned my Face to the Door, designing to leave him; But before I stirred from the place, there was a sudden Eruption of Wind and Fire: I will prove, said he, *against you, there is no Imparity among Church-officers of the same Kind and Office.* When I saw him thus transported, and that

that he designed nothing but Jangling, and Insulting, I resolved to be silent; and to contend with him no more. However he proceeded; Timothy and Titus, said he, were Evangelists, as you say; and they had Sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction. But Philip, who is called an Evangelist, had no such Power; but only a Power of Preaching and Baptizing; therefore there is Imparity among Church officers of the same Kind.

As I had resolved, so I kept silence, my Back being turned to him, and my Face to the Door. Then he insulted and reflected, till at last I could not forbear to turn about to him, and check him for his Rudeness; he says, *I did, in a manner crow over him*; but truly my crowing could scarce be heard for the noise of his barking. When he urged me again and again to speak in Answer unto him, I said, *Philip had all the same Power that Timothy and Titus had*; he says I offered an argument to prove it, though it was but my answer to his argument, and a Negation of the Minor thereof, I was about to add something more, but indeed he interrupted me without Patience to hear what I was to say; He told me *I could not form an argument*, he would do it for me, and answer it when he had done; and accordingly he went on: I thought with my self, it was but folly to strive with him; and so I let him say what he pleased. But he was greatly mistaken of my Design; for that which I was going to say, when he stopt me, was this; *that it is clear Philip was an Evangelist; and if he had no more Power, but only to Preach and Baptize (according to his argument) then the meanest Paroch pastor has as much Power as he had*. This he did not wait to hear; he answered the Matter before he heard it, as if he had known what I had in my Mind, better than I knew it my self; Let him consider that Scripture, Prov. 18. 13. *He that answers a matter before he hears it, it is folly, and shame unto him*.

However, he says I insisted to argue, &c. I do remember when he insisted in his own way, talking of the Power that Timothy and Titus were invested with above the Pastors of Ephesus and Crete: I did say it agreed to them as Evangelists: and he denying it, I said, there is no other Consideration can be assigned under which it did agreed to them: I deny that, said he, for it agreed to them as Bishops of Ephesus and Crete: To which I rejoined, *they were not Bishops of Ephesus and Crete*; and therefore it did not agree to them as such. In the mean time, while I was speaking these Words, a Gentleman, whom I knew not, said to me, *Cause him prove they were Bishops of Ephesus & Crete; he has said they were so, and a firmanti incumbit probatio*; Whereupon my Adversary turned upon him, and bawled a while against him; untill either he, or some other Gentleman present, said very gravely, *these things should not be debated*.

lated in a Publick Shop, but in another place ; and with these Words the Storm was laid : for the Episcopal Divine said no more that I heard : and so I had Liberty to come away.

Thus I have given an account of that Debate in the Shop, and so far as I remember, it is according to Truth. What the Sentiments of any present were, they know best themselves ; they saw I could not hold up with him in Railing and Ranting. I confess I never had the Art of Scolding and Bawling ; but this Man has such a way of it, that when he falls upon it, there is no standing before him by those that cannot Bawl and Banter it again. I have considered that part of his Pamphlet which concerns my self from page 22 to page 30. at least the most material things therein ; his personal Reflections I let them pass without regard. In the rest of his Pamphlet, viz. from the beginning to page 11. and from page 30 to the end, he directly levels against some others than me ; therefore I shall not take on me to answer the same : but I hope these Worthy men concerned will not let him go with his Boasting without Control. He does in a manner bid a Defiance to the whole Commission of the General Assembly ; but let him try it when he will, he may find that one of them is enough for him and all his Arguments,

F I N I S.

Printed in the Year. 1703.

(24)

THE BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON

EXHIBITION OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE



BRITISH MUSEUM

BRITISH MUSEUM

